

Docket No.: 239700US2

OBION
SPIVAK
MCCLELIAND
MAIER
&
NEUSTADT
P.C.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

RE: Application Serial No.: 10/609,399

Applicants: Kohichi KATOH, et al.

Filing Date: July 1, 2003

For: TONER COMPOSITION, TWO COMPONENT

DEVELOPER USING THE TONER COMPOSITION.

AND METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR

DEVELOPING ELECTROSTATIC LATENT IMAGE

USING THE TONER COMPOSITION

Group Art Unit: 1756

Examiner: DOTE, JANIS L.

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME - 1 MONTH

Our credit card payment form in the amount of \$120.00 is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Gregory J. Maier

Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number

22850

(703) 413-3000 (phone) (703) 413-2220 (fax) Katherine D. Pauley Registration No. 50,607

1:\ATTY\KDP\23's\239700US\239700US RESTRICTION RESPONSE CVR 7.11.05.DOC



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF

KOHICHI KATOH, ET AL. : EXAMINER: DOTE, JANIS L.

SERIAL NO: 10/609,399

FILED: JULY 1, 2003 : GROUP ART UNIT: 1756

FOR: TONER COMPOSITION, TWO COMPONENT DEVELOPER USING THE TONER COMPOSITION, AND METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR DEVELOPING ELECTROSTATIC LATENT IMAGE USING THE TONER COMPOSITION

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Restriction Requirement dated May 11, 2005, Applicants provisionally elect with traverse Group I, and identify Claims 1-7, and 13-17 as readable on the elected group.

Applicants traverse the outstanding Restriction Requirement because, as set forth in MPEP § 803: "If the search examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions."

The Claims of Groups I and II appear to be part of an overlapping search area.

Therefore, Applicants traverse the outstanding Restriction Requirement on the grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a serious burden on the Examiner.

Application No. 10/609,399
Reply to Restriction Requirement dated May 11, 2005

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the requirement to elect a single group be withdrawn, and that a full examination on the merits of Claims 1-17 be conducted.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{Customer Number} \\ 22850 \end{array}$

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 06/04) Gregory J. Maier O Attorney of Record Registration No. 25,599

Kotherene D Pauley

Katherine D. Pauley Registration No. 50,607

I:\ATTY\KDP\23'\$\239700U\$\239700u\$ RESTRICTION RESPONSE 7.11.05.DOC